|                                 | Case 3:05-cr-00447-CRB D  | ocument 60 Filed 02/16/06 Page 1 of 2  |  |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                 |   |  |  |
| 1                               |   |  |  |
| 2                               |   |  |  |
| 3                               |   |  |  |
| 4                               |   |  |  |
| 5                               |   |  |  |
| 6                               |   |  |  |
| 7                               |   |  |  |
| 8                               | INJUED OF   | ATEC DICTRICT COLUDT   |  |
| 9                               | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA                         |  |  |
| 10                              | SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  |  |  |
| 11                              | SANTK   | ANCISCO DIVISION   |  |
| 12                              | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,   | ) No. CR 05-00395 CRB  |  |
| 13                              | Plaintiff,  | -[PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2006 TO APRIL 5, 2006 UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT |  |
| 14                              | V.  |  |  |
| 15                              | YOUNG JOON YANG, et al.   |  |  |
| 16                              | Defendants.   | )<br>No. CR 05-00447 CRB   |  |
| 17                              | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,   |  |  |
| 18                              | Plaintiff,  |  |  |
| 19                              | v.  |  |  |
| 20                              | MISUK MOORE, et al.,  |  |  |
| 21                              | Defendants  |  |  |
| 22                              |   | No. CR 05-00613 CRB  |  |
| 23                              | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,   | )<br>}   |  |
| <ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul> | Plaintiff,  |  |  |
| 26                              | v.  |  |  |
| 27                              | CHANG KUN KIM,  |  |  |
| 28                              | Defendant.  |  |  |
| 20                              |   |  |  |
|                                 | On February 1, 2006, defendants in the above-captioned matter appeared, with counsel, |  |  |
|                                 | ORDER<br>CR 05-00395 CRB/CR 05-00447 CRB/CR 05-00613 CRB                              |  |  |
|                                 | CR 05-005/5 CRB/CR 05-0044/ CRB/CR 05-00015 CRB                                       |  |  |

1 2

3 4

5

6 7

9

8

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

before the Court for a status conference. Assistant United States Attorney Peter B. Axelrod appeared on behalf of the United States.

The parties agreed to a continuance of the matter to April 5, 2006, and a corresponding exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act (18 U.S.C. § 3161) to provide defense counsel with sufficient time to obtain and review additional discovery.

Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time from February 1, 2006 to April 5, 2006 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. For the reasons set forth above, the Court finds that the failure to grant the requested exclusion would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Further, the Court finds the exclusion warranted on complexity grounds, under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(ii), based on the number of defendants (31 charged), the number of calls on the wire (exceeding 33,000) and the fact that the vast majority of the calls are in the Korean language. Thus, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested exclusion outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A), (h)(8)(B)(ii) and (h)(8)(B)(iv). IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 16, 2006

